APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,435	11/08/2001	John Lin	BP 1906	3043

51472	7590	11/29/2005		EXAMINER

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON LLP
P.O. BOX 160727
AUSTIN, TX 78716-0727

YUN, EUGENE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2682	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/007,435	LIN, JOHN
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Eugene Yun	2682	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-17 and 22-32*</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>*1-16*</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) <u>*31 and 32*</u> is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>*17,22-25,28 and 29*</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>*26,27 and 30*</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*08 November 2001*</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is over 150

words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Salonidis et al. (US 2003/0096576) in view of Trost et al. (US 2002/0151275).

Referring to Claim 17, Salonidis teaches a microsequencer for use as a real-time

Bluetooth baseband controller, comprising:

Timer circuitry operable coupled to receive a requested timer counting value and

to announce when the timer counting value has elapsed (see paragraph [0044]);

Temporary data storage circuitry operable coupled to store data (see paragraph

[0069]).

Salonidis does not teach a plurality of Bluetooth and native clocks operably coupled to

support timing functionality of the timer circuitry according to Bluetooth specifications

when in a master mode. Trost teaches a plurality of Bluetooth and native clocks

operably coupled to support timing functionality of the timer circuitry according to

Bluetooth specifications when in a master mode (see paragraph [0054]); and

A plurality of externally-driven Bluetooth and native clocks operably coupled to

support timing functionality of the timer circuitry according to Bluetooth specifications

when in a slave mode (see paragraphs [0056] and [0057]). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

provide the teachings of Trost to said device of Salonidis in order to make more efficient

use of a short range air interface.

4.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Salonidis and Trost and further in view of Watanabe (US 6,731,939).

Referring to Claim 23, the combination of Salonidis and Trost does not teach a

48-bit storage register. Watanabe teaches a 48-bit storage register (see col. 6, lines 10-

15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to provide the teachings of Watanabe to the modified device of

Salonidis and Trost in order to expand the capabilities of the storage register.

5.   Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Salonidis and Trost and further in view of Schmidl et al. (US 6,839,325).

Referring to Claim 22, the combination of Salonidis and Trost does not teach a

64-bit storage register. Schmidl teaches a 64-bit storage register (see col. 13, lines 30-

43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to provide the teachings of Schmidl to the modified device of

Salonidis and Trost in order to expand the capabilities of the storage register.

Referring to Claim 24, Schmidl also teaches a 32-bit storage register (see col.

13, lines 30-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Schmidl to the modified

device of Salonidis and Trost in order to expand the capabilities of the storage register.

6.   Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Salonidis and Trost and further in view of Ukita et al. (US 6,373,791).

Referring to Claim 25, the combination of Salonidis and Trost does not teach a

16-bit storage register. Ukita teaches a 16-bit storage register (see col. 6, lines 61-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to provide the teachings of Schmidl to the modified device of

Salonidis and Trost in order to expand the capabilities of the storage register.

7.   Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Salonidis and Trost in view of Benjaram et al. (US 5,131,015).

Referring to Claim 28, the combination of Salonidis and Trost does not teach at

least four timers. Benjaram teaches at least four timers (see col. 5, lines 4-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to provide the teachings of Benjaram to the modified device of

Salonidis and Trost in order to ensure faster processing of data.

Referring to Claim 29, Benjaram also teaches at least eight timers (see col. 5, lines 4-12).

Allowable Subject Matter

8.   Claims 26, 27, and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding Claim 26, Watanabe, Benjaram, Ukita, and Schmidl do not teach, alone nor in combination, the temporary data storage circuitry including a 64-bit register, a 48-bit register, a 32-bit register, and a 16-bit register.

Regarding Claim 27, Watanabe, Benjaram, Ukita, and Schmidl do not teach, alone nor in combination, the temporary data storage circuitry comprising registers of different size and a data storage logic module, which data storage logic module determines which available register should be used for storing the data based upon the size of the data that is to be temporarily stored.

9.   Claims 31 and 32 are allowed.

Regarding Claim 31, Watanabe, Benjaram, Ukita, and Schmidl do not teach, alone nor in combination, a 64-bit storage register, a 48-bit storage register, a 32-bit storage register, a 16-bit storage register, and data storage logic circuitry for determining which of the temporary storage registers is to store a piece of data that is to

be temporarily stored in a microsequencer for use as a real-time Bluetooth baseband controller.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17, 22-25, 28 and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Yun whose telephone number is (571) 272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Quochien Vuong can be reached on (571)272-7902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eugene Yun
Examiner
Art Unit 2682

EY

MARCEAU MILORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER